



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJBcRR_7747
Title of the Manuscript:	Multi-detection by target mixed loop-mediated isothermal amplification
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors performed their Multiplex LAMP at 62 °C (sera samples) and 65 °C (Mouse CDNA) for 1 hr. They do not explain/justify why they used these conditions. Did they perform the same LAMP at different temperatures (60-65 °C) and at different time points e.g. 20 minutes; 30 minutes etc? It could be interesting to know their observations..... Lines 81-85 should be shifted to Materials and Methods section.	In Material and methods (2.2), we wrote that “We chose the reaction temperature that the specific amplification occurred.” We shifted lines 81-85 to Materials and Methods section.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 29: remove “, such as virus and bacterium,” There are several grammatical errors in the manuscript that need to be attended to, e.g. Lines 113-114: LAMP amplification was occurred two of four sera..... Lines 120-121: suggesting the mixture of the primer does not influence in LAMP reaction..... Line 128: Target mixed LAMP from mouse cDNA..... Line 133: These results were concurrent with the results of real time	We remove “, such as virus and bacterium,” We employed an English-language editing service to polish our wording.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	PCR..... Line 135: was confirmed by dot blot hybridization, resulting in that all cDNA was amplified..... Line 151: it is desirable for each primer to design the conditions by which amplification is performed as soon as possible..... Lines 151-152: We have amplified with HBV DNA prepared from sera [2], but HCV and HIV prepared from sera have not yet amplified..... Line 154: reverse transcription LAMP was used to detection of RNA virus..... Lines 177-178: It is possible to be endpoint detection using a fluorescent metal indicator such as calcein in clinical 178 practice [16].....	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an important study on multiplex LAMP, with the potential of simultaneously detecting several pathogens using a mixture of primer pairs targeting different genes. The study was well designed and generated interesting data. The only weakness in this manuscript is the “language” i.e. English. The authors could have benefited by asking a native English speaker to edit the paper prior to submission..... Although their data are very interesting and convincing, the authors are unable to fully interpret and discuss them and their implications!	